scaling study of dynamical smeared-link fermions

(arXiv:0802.2706v1)

Thorsten Kurth, University of Wuppertal

Budapest-Marseille-Wuppertal Collaboration (S. Dürr, Z. Fodor, C. Hölbling, R. Hoffmann, S.D. Katz, S. Krieg, T. Kurth, L. Lellouch, T. Lippert, K.K. Szabo, G. Vulvert)

outline

- choices of actions
- simulation algorithm
- metastabilities
- scaling study
- summary

choices of actions

gauge action: Symanzik improved "thin-link" action

$$> S_G^{Sym} = \beta \left[\frac{c_0}{3} \sum_{\text{plaq}} \text{Tr} \operatorname{Re}(1 - U_{\text{plaq}}) + \frac{c_1}{3} \sum_{\text{rect}} \text{Tr} \operatorname{Re}(1 - U_{\text{rect}}) \right]$$

fermionic action: clover improved wilson ("smeared-link")

>
$$S_F^{SW} = S_F^W[V] - \frac{c_{SW}}{4} \sum_x \sum_{\mu\nu} \psi_x \,\sigma_{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu,x}[V] \,\psi_x$$

the parameters are set to their tree-level values

$$> c_{SW} = 1, \quad c_1 = -1/12, \quad c_0 = 1 - 8c_1 = 5/3$$

- "smeared-link" refers to stout (EXP)- or HEX-smeared links
 - Why Stout-smearing: • stout-smearing (ρ = - Widely used ystar, Peardon (2004) - Shares features with $V^{(n+1)} = e^{\rho S^{(n)}}$ different $\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\text{ReTr}}{6}\right)$ Finhaced scaling $S^{(n)} =$ region) $\Gamma^{(n)}_{x,\mu} = \sum V_x$ $\nu \neq \mu$
 - HEX-smearing is achieved within the HYP-smearing links
 - 2 steps of HEX-smearing parameters $\alpha_1=0.95$, $\alpha_2=$

HEX-Smearing: locality does not become worse when applying several steps.

by using stout smeared links smeared lölbling (2007)

simulation algorithm

- HMC/RHMC integrator with following improvements
 - multiple time-scale integration to reduce computational Costs
 Sexton, Weingarten (1992)
 - > mass preconditioning for reducing fluctuations in the force <u>Hasenbusch (2001), Urbach (2006)</u>
 - > omelyan integrator for improved energy conservation
- used mixed precision solver for Dirac-inversions in the sea- and valence-sector to speed-up inversions
 Giusti et al. (2003)
- we chose N_f=3 for easier tuning (RHMC treats third flavour)

Omelyan et al. (2003)

metastabilities

 dynamical simulations with very small quark masses may become unphysical Aoki et al., Farchioni et al. (2005)

- problem occurs at coarse lattices and weakens with smearing
- problem is absent in simulations with O(a) improved actions (fermionic and gauge)
- in case this problem is present, it will show up in a hysteresis in the plaquettes thermal cycle

No washing out of hysteresis: 100 Therms and 200 prods with nmeas=10!

absence

thermal

fixed stra

and vary

ascendir

(circles,



scaling study

- the scaling runs were performed at 5 different β (from 2.8 up to 3.76) and lattice spaces with L/a varying from 8 to 24, and we chose N_t=2L
- for each beta, we generated configs at at least 5 different wilson masses, where we made sure that the simulation stayed in the (M_πL>4)-regime, so that finite volume effects are negligible
- to deal with the errors, we performed a moving block bootstrap (MBB) analysis with 2000 samples and repeated the whole analysis on each MBB sample
- the integrated autocorrelation time for <P> is between seven and ten trajectories, hence we choose a larger MBB binning for the finer lattices

- generated correlators using Gaussian/Wall or C
- we extracted the PCAC-mass, needed for the for every run by averaging over the correspond always been very well pronounced

PCAC mass needed for interpolation -> best scaling properties of masses while quantity itself has the smallest error (systematical and statistical)

- we extracted the masses for the spin-0 (M_π) are (mp), me (mn) and 3/2 (M_Δ) particles, using a correlated cosh-/sinh-fit, where the covariance matrix has been estimated using the MBB samples and was chosen to be constant on each MBB sample
- we made sure that no excited states have been fitted
- for each β, we fitted the extracted masses lineal interpolated for different LCP with M_π/M_ρ∈{0.6,

Choose rather large masses: enhance possible O(a) discretization effects



mass interpolation (HEX)

linear fits of the spectrum in terms of m_{PCAC} (β =3.4, L/a=12)



continuum scaling I (HEA)

 M_N in terms of M_{π} vs a^2 (in units of M_{π}^{-2}) for three different LCP



continuum scaling I (HEA)

 M_{Δ} in terms of M_{π} vs a^2 (in units of M_{π}^{-2}) for three different LCP



Continuum scaling II (EXP)

 M_{Δ} in terms of M_{π} vs a^2 (in units of M_{π}^{-2}) for three different LCP



continuum scaling III (HEX)

scaling of M_N and M_Δ using

 $M_{\pi}/M_{\rho} = \sqrt{2M_{K,\text{phys}}^2 - M_{\pi,\text{phys}}^2/M_{\phi,\text{phys}}} \simeq 0.67$

Scaling down

to a⁻¹<1.3 GeV

summary

- performed a scaling analysis with an efficient stout/HEX-link smeared clover and symanzik improved algorithm at N_f=3
- no metastabilities for all lattice sizes and masses
- according to our expectations and experiences with simulations in the quenched case, we found a

large scaling region up to $a \approx 0.2$ fm

with small scaling corrections